

right and responsible thing is to bail out Mexico.

The value of the Mexican currency, the peso, fell a dangerous 40 percent in just three weeks. In one week alone, American investors withdrew \$12 billion dollars from Mexico. But—that's the free market at work.

Our middle class stands to be a big loser in this deal. Of the billions of dollars pumped into Mexico in the wake of NAFTA, many were invested by U.S. speculators who sent to Mexico the hard-earned dollars of middle class families in the form of mutual or pension fund investments.

With the passage of NAFTA, we created a speculative environment in which middle class investors, the mom and pop investors so vital to Wall Street brokers, were led to believe that investing some of their hard-earned life savings on emerging Mexico was a safe bet. But billions of dollars later, we know it's not.

Now the United States proposes to act as a lender of last resort to salvage the Mexican economy. But will this bailout really help? Even the most ardent NAFTA supporters have their doubts. Listen to avid NAFTA backer, Wesley Smith of the Heritage Foundation: "This takes real pressure off the Mexican Government to make substantive changes." James K. Glassman of the Washington Post agrees that the loan guarantees may provide a disincentive for reforms in Mexico. Like parents who are too lenient with a rebellious adolescent, we may be encouraging misbehavior in the future. We may be helping the speculators who poured money into Mexico, but harming the prospects there for economic and political reform. I have serious doubts as to whether the Administration's proposals will win my support.

If the United States is going to be generous as a lender of last resort, then it is appropriate that we ask Mexico to be a first-rate client. The administration must insist on assurances that would make the loan guarantee effective:

The money that the United States guarantees must only be used for what it is intended: to pay the debts on short-term Mexican bonds.

If we are going to bail out speculators, then we should protect middle class Americans by reporting to the American people through this legislation the losses they incurred through mutual or pension funds invested in Mexico.

The billions in oil revenues that Mexico earns annually must be used as collateral should the Mexican Government default.

The Mexican Government should accelerate and broaden its privatization program.

The Mexican Government should continue the political, economic, and social reforms that it requires if it is to achieve long-term stability.

And by the way, none of this money should be used to prop up the 36 year

Cuban dictatorship of Fidel Castro, who has recently benefited from generous Mexican investments, debt forgiveness, and debt-for-equity swaps. No Mexican foreign assistance, nor any investments sustained by United States credit lines, should go to Cuba's oppressors—neither from the Mexican Government nor any of its banks or state-related companies. Not one red cent.

This crisis is about speculation. It is about the speculative environment created by those who supported NAFTA without the appropriate safeguards. That speculative environment has led to the loss of billions of United States dollars invested by hard-working American families who put their savings in mutual funds and pension funds investing in Mexico. It is time to bring a reality check to the risks of the emerging markets and to the joys of the good old U.S. Treasury and blue chip stocks.

□ 2100

#### NUTRITION PROVISIONS IN THE PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GEKAS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the provisions in the Personal Responsibility Act which contains a food assistance block grant.

The child nutrition provisions in the Personal Responsibility Act will completely eliminate the National School Lunch Program as it has existed since 1946. The Personal Responsibility Act would combine a set of Federal food assistance programs—including food stamps, school lunch, school breakfast, the WIC Program, elderly nutrition, and the Emergency Food Assistance Program [TEFAP] into a single block grant to States, with a reduction in overall funding for the programs. The House Republican Conference has estimated that the 4-year reduction in funding as compared with current law would be \$11 billion. Probably a more accurate reduction is \$17.5 billion as projected by the center on budget and policy priorities.

There are many reasons why I oppose the block grant method for the distribution of funds:

Historically, when Federal funds have been left to the discretion of a few, they have not been distributed to the most impoverished or the ones in need the most. Giving States carte blanche authority does not guarantee that Federal funds will be used to address the national needs that Congress has identified.

By definition, block grant programs do not require that specified programs are provided for specifically targeted populations. Reporting and evaluation requirements for most block grants are so limited that information about program participation levels, implementation and effectiveness is not sufficient to provide guidance for continued funding of the programs.

Even though education is administered through 50 States and over 15,000 local educational agencies [LEA's], and conditions do differ among States and LEA's, certain identi-

able national problems are of sufficient importance to merit special Federal programs.

For these and other reasons, I ask my colleagues to oppose this movement to combine nutrition programs into a block grant.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FORBES] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

#### WHY I SUPPORT THE BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise today in support of the Contract With America's version of the balanced budget amendment that requires a three-fifths vote of this body in order to raise taxes. It is the most responsible proposal on the table for bringing down our national debt and applying discipline against this Nation's outrageous spending programs.

I support the tax limitation amendment because I agree with President Reagan who so often reminded us that the problem is not that the government spends too little. It is that the American people are taxed too much.

The budget must be balanced, and it must be balanced by cutting spending, not by raising taxes.

On election day, Mr. Speaker, the people in my area on Long Island and the rest of the country spoke loud and clearly. They sent me and my new colleagues in the freshman class—in fact they sent all of us here to Washington with a very specific mission, to end business as usual. No more raising taxes, no more reckless spending, no more of the arrogance and the double standards that have plagued this distinguished body and that have punished this country for the past half century. My neighbors on eastern Long Island want Members of Congress, and in fact all of Washington, to start acting like so many families have to act, with responsibility for our actions and a good dose of common sense in our decisions. But the people's call for responsibility was not an angry and hysterical demand for change of any sort. On the contrary, Mr. Speaker, it was a very specific endorsement of a very particular set of policies.

The Contract With America is a study in middle class values, and ideas and goals that can bring our government, once and for all, under control and restore fiscal integrity across this Nation, and the notions contained in the Contract With America, to the chagrin of many of my Democratic colleagues, have been embraced by the people whom we have the privilege and the obligation to serve, and key to our contract with the people is a tax limitation balanced budget amendment, a call to live within our means, a demand

to keep our books in order. It is a reasonable, common sense request that simply requires that we will not spend more money than we have.

But after listening to so much of the discourse today, and as we will listen tomorrow, I am shocked that so many people in this body still do not quite get it. Some people think that it is OK for Congress to go on spending more money than we take in and to spend money faster than it is printed while too many middle class families, who we are supposed to champion, are at home struggling to try to meet basic needs, while parents at home in my area in Medford, and Speonk, and Montauk, and Smithtown, are working sometimes two, and three, and even four jobs to meet their monthly obligations, to try to put money aside to send their children to college. This body has routinely voted to mortgage their children's future with reckless spending programs that have left us with a \$4.7 trillion debt.

Now let us be absolutely clear about what this means. Congress has spent \$4.7 trillion and never had the money to back it up. That is a pretty bad credit rating in my book, and in the book of most of America's families, and in the credit book of most of America's businesses. Decency, responsibility and basic fairness all demand that we balance the budget and that we do it without raising taxes, but so does the law of economics. A higher deficit is proof positive of fiscal irresponsibility.

□ 2110

It leads to higher long-term interest rates, that in turn decrease investment and economic expansion. The effect on our country's small business community is devastating.

Let me quote from a letter that is circulating here from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the largest representative of our Nation's small businesses. The Chamber of Commerce writes to each Member of this House,

Perhaps more than any other sector of the American economy, small businesses have felt the effects of Federal fiscal mismanagement and inefficiencies. Large and growing Federal deficits reduce savings and investment, stymie income and job growth, and reduce our overall standard of living. They ultimately lead to increased taxes, higher interest rates, and reduced global competitiveness.

The bottom line is obvious. We must balance the budget, and we must do it without raising taxes, and we must start today.

We owe it to the American people to start behaving like grownups. But just deciding to balance the budget is one thing. Actually doing it is quite another, as we are finding out, and it is a much more difficult task. But time after time, this House has attempted to rein in spending and pare down the deficit.

Some of us will remember that 10 years ago here in Washington, an innovative creation came to the floor, it

was called Gramm-Rudman-Mack. And it was a good effort to slow the growth in Federal spending, and it followed years and years and years of promises to rein in Federal spending and get toward a balanced budget. And Gramm-Rudman worked for a few years, until it was gutted in the 1990 budget deal.

Likewise, the Kasich-Penny budget cuts were a courageous proposal to reduce spending, but they too were rejected because the choices were just too tough for a body that lacks the discipline and the political courage to make them work.

A balanced budget amendment to the Constitution that includes real tax limitation is the only way of imposing discipline upon Congress that it needs to get the job done. Too much time has been spent hoping and talking and breaking promises and waiving the rules. And all that time the debt has continued to soar.

The reason I think it has been so difficult for measures like Gramm-Rudman and Kasich-Penny to succeed is because it is difficult to cut spending, and it is difficult to say no to powerful lobbyists and concentrated special interests that permeate this town. But ultimately, cutting spending is the only responsible way to balance the budget.

Let me be perfectly clear: We cannot, we must not, force the people of this country to pay higher taxes, because we do not have the political will to make the tough choices. And time and time again we have examples that this body has lacked that political will.

Simply put, the budget should not be balanced on the backs of the taxpayers, and that is why I am a strong supporter of the Barton balanced budget tax limitation amendment. The Barton amendment's 60 percent supermajority is the strongest defense we have against the easy route of punishing the taxpayers for this body's spending excesses. It forces Washington to cut spending, to get rid of waste, and to do it all without raising taxes. Not only is raising taxes in order to balance the budget an unfair and irresponsible way to go, it just does not work as well.

The 1990 budget agreement promised to reduce the deficit by \$500 billion over five years simply by raising taxes. But now, 5 years later and after lots of pain, our so-called reward for paying higher taxes has not been a lower deficit, has not been a reduced debt. As a matter of fact, precisely the opposite effect has occurred. Since the 1990 budget agreement, the debt has grown by more than \$800 billion. And the lesson is simple: More taxes lead to more spending and a higher public debt. More taxes do not balance the budget. They simply rob the American people of their hard-earned dollars.

The solution to this crazy cycle of taxing and spending is the solid tax limitation proposed by the Barton amendment. By requiring 60 percent of the Congress to approve a tax increase rather than a simple majority, we

guarantee that tax hikes will not be the solution to a problem that originates on the spending side of the Federal budget.

To quote Milton Friedman in a recent Wall Street Journal editorial, it cannot be emphasized too much that the real burden on the economy is what government spends or mandates others to spend, rather than how much it receives in taxes.

And he is right. Raising taxes can only lead to an increased debt. If we are serious about wanting a balanced budget, if we are serious about wanting to live responsibly and within our means, then we must be serious about opposing any and all tax increases. And the only balanced budget amendment that guarantees that is the Barton balanced budget amendment. That is the original balanced budget amendment in the Contract With America.

The Barton amendment imposes a discipline that this House lacks and that this House has proven time and again it is willing to waive. The economic facts back up the Barton amendment's central theory that too much spending is the cause of the deficit, not insufficient revenues.

Since the 1960's, Federal spending as a percentage of Gross Domestic Product has increased by 5 percent, from less than 18 percent in the sixties, to more than 23 percent in 1995. But at the same time that the rate of government spending has increased so dramatically, the Government's revenue from taxes has actually stayed fairly steady, between 18 and 19 percent. Essentially, while the rate of government spending has increased, the percentage of that spending that the Government pays with tax revenues has stayed the same.

The difference in those two figures is our deficit. These numbers prove that the real cause of the deficit is too much spending, not too few tax dollars. And the Barton amendment is the perfect antidote to this problem. It safeguards the hard earned dollars of America's families from the greedy hand of a bureaucratic government. It makes sure that the taxpayers do not have to subsidize the spending habits of the tax spenders.

The Barton balanced budget amendment will work. Four of the last five major tax increases that this House unfortunately passed did not receive a 60 percent supermajority in the House. If we had had the Barton amendment in place just 2 years ago, President Clinton could never have passed the largest tax increase in this Nation's history.

Opponents of tax limitation say that it goes too far, that it shouldn't be any more difficult to raise taxes than it is to do anything else in this body. To them I respond that holding the line on taxes is one of the most important obligations of this Congress, this new and dynamic 104th Congress. We must do everything that we possibly can to guarantee that the incessant urge of this body to tax is calmed. Tax limitation is not radical, it is necessary. It is

right, and it is a proper antidote to the perennial Congressional sickness of taxing and spending. The American people have spoken. More than 80 percent of the hard working men and women of this great country have balanced their own budgets, and they expect us to do the same. It is now our obligation to act.

I am proud to stand with my colleague from Texas and my friends from across this great Nation who have the courage to cut spending and balance the budget without punishing the already overburdened American taxpayer. I urge full consideration of the balanced budget amendment with the tax limitation included.

I yield to the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. SEASTRAND].

□ 2120

Mrs. SEASTRAND. Mr. Speaker, my constituents elected me to do a job, to pass the agenda I campaigned on and to disagree with legislation that is not good for my district. The tax limitation balanced budget amendment is not only good for my district, it is good for my State of California and it is good for America and it is good for our future.

We have the chance to fundamentally change the way Washington operates. Nothing will change Congress more than to force basic budgetary discipline on Washington.

I want to point out a little-noticed fact about the three-fifths balanced budget amendment. What this amendment does is to let the people speak. No one seems to talk about the fact that after Congress passes this amendment, 38 of our 50 States must approve it. We should let the people speak. Since 49 States already operate under a balanced budget requirement, the American people know this balanced budget requirement will work.

If in our personal lives we are required to balance our budgets, if in our business worlds we are required to balance the books, and if States are required to balance their budget, there is no reasons why we cannot have a balanced budget in Washington, DC.

Because the Barton amendment requires a three-fifths supermajority to raise taxes, our budget would be balanced from cutting spending, not from raising taxes on hard-working American families.

I just ask that we support the Barton amendment, the tax limitation balanced budget amendment.

I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas, [Mr. BARTON].

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I thank the distinguished gentleman. I want to thank him for taking this special order this evening on the eve of the most historic day, in my opinion, in the history of the U.S. Congress.

Tomorrow, when we vote on the tax limitation balanced budget amend-

ment, I think there is a tremendous opportunity to put a halt to the spiraling spending spree that this nation has been on at the Federal level the last 30 to 40 years.

I would like to ask the gentleman from New York and perhaps some of our other colleagues that are here to help me in a little exercise, question and answer.

I would first ask the gentleman if he knew the last time we actually had a federal budget that spending went down from the previous year? Would the gentleman from New York happen to know when that might have been?

Mr. FORBES. I believe it may have been as far back as the Truman administration; is that correct?

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Well, it was not quite that far back, but in 1964, we spent at the Federal level \$118.5 billion. To put that into perspective, last year we spent over \$200 billion just to pay interest on the national debt. But in 1964, the entire Federal budget was \$118.5 billion.

In 1965, while I was a senior at West Junior High School in Waco, TX, playing on the football team and going on my first date and watching the Untouchables on television, things like this, the Federal Government actually spent less money than the year before, \$118.2 billion. So we went down \$300 million that year. That is the last year that federal spending has decreased from the previous year.

In each year since then, 1966, 1967, 1968, all the way down to the current date, Federal spending has increased.

Would the gentleman from New York care to hazard a guess as to the first year the Federal Government spent more than \$200 billion?

Mr. FORBES. I may yield to one of my colleagues. I did not do well on the last question.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. We have the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina, from Arizona, the distinguished gentlewoman from Idaho, from Pennsylvania, would any of these Members care to hazard as to when was the first year the Federal Government spent \$200 billion?

The distinguished gentleman from South Carolina says 1968. That is the year I was a senior at Waco High School in Waco, TX. The actual year was 1971. So it took us from 1964, when we first—1962, when we first broke the \$100 billion spending barrier, to 1971, 9 years, and then we spent \$200 billion.

When do you think we spent for the first time \$300 billion. What year?

Mr. FORBES. 1975.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. 1975 is correct.

Mr. FORBES. Thank you.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. 1975 we spent \$332 billion, for the first time spent over \$300 billion.

When do you think we spent \$400 billion for the first time?

Mr. FORBES. Well, let us try 1978.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. 1978. The exact answer is 1977. I see that the Speaker has arisen.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. GEKAS). Only to remind the Members that the gentleman from New York controls the time, so that the yielding has to conform to that pattern.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I respect the Speaker's ruling. I apologize. I knew better than to violate the rules of the House.

Would the gentleman from New York yield and give me an opportunity to ask a question to the gentleman?

Mr. FORBES. I am glad to yield to my friend from Texas.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I appreciate the gentleman from New York yielding.

As I pointed out, it took us 9 years to go from \$100 billion to \$200 billion. It took four years to go from 200 billion to 300 billion. It took three years to go from 300 billion to 400 billion. And we first breached the 400 billion barrier in 1977.

When would the gentleman from New York hazard a guess as to when we first spent a half a trillion dollars or \$500 billion? What fiscal year would that be?

Mr. FORBES. Fiscal year 1979.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Would the gentleman yield for me to answer the question?

Mr. FORBES. Yes, I yield to my colleague.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I thank the gentleman for yielding. The actual year was 1979. I would think the gentleman may have looked at my notes.

Mr. FORBES. These figures are getting bleaker. Is there any frame of reference that there is a local government that perhaps has gone 30 years or a school district that has gone 30 years without balancing its budget or a State government that consistently has gone that length of time without balancing their budgets?

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, to my knowledge and myself and my staff and the Congressional Research Service and the Heritage Foundation and the Citizens for a Sound Economy and many other conservative think tanks have researched this question. We can find no record of any other State or local entity that has gone that many consecutive years without at least once balancing their budget.

Mr. FORBES. And yet what we are establishing here is that the Federal Government in the greatest Nation on this earth has failed to balance its budget for over 30 years?

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Has not balanced the budget, the Federal Government has not balanced its budget since 1969, as the gentleman pointed out in his remarks.

The point that I am trying to make by this question and answer session is that in every year since 1965, Federal spending has gone up, so that in the

year that we are in now, Federal spending is expected to be \$1.531 trillion. That is a 1,300-fold increase in Federal spending in the last 29 years. In no year has Federal spending decreased. It has gone up.

In the decade of the 1990's, from fiscal year 1990 through the fiscal year that we are now currently in, fiscal year 1995, Federal spending has increased an average of \$65 billion, an average of \$65 billion. That is an annual rate of over 6 percent in an era when the inflation rate has gone up less than 3 percent per year.

So what does this all mean? It means, quite simply, that lack of revenue is not the problem in Washington, DC. The problem is that spending is out of control, increasing at a rate of over \$60 billion a year in the decade of the 1990's, and annual deficits in the \$100 to \$200 billion range. So we need to do something about it, and we need to pass a balanced budget amendment. We need to pass a tax limitation balanced budget amendment, because tax limitation keeps spending under control and forces the legislative body that is accountable to cut spending, not to just spend more money and raise taxes.

□ 2130

Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would look at the charts to his left, he can see that in the period between 1980 and 1990, in the nine States that had tax limitation provisions in their Constitution or their statutes, that taxes went up in those States a total of 87 percent cumulatively in a 10-year period, but in States that didn't, taxes went up 104 percent. That is a difference of 17 percent.

The States that had tax limitation, spending also went up, but it went up less than in States that didn't have it, 95 percent over the 10-year period versus 102 percent. That is a difference of 7 percent.

That is statistical verification that tax limitation does work. It limits taxes, obviously, and more importantly, it limits spending, and in Washington, DC, that is our problem, limiting spending.

Therefore, tomorrow when we vote on the tax limitation balanced budget amendment, it is very important that we get an affirmative vote, because that is what is the solution to the problem. It is not simply saying "balance the budget," and directly or indirectly putting the emphasis on raising more revenue. We don't need more revenue, we need the fiscal discipline to cut spending, and the tax limitation amendment gives that discipline.

Mr. Speaker, we do have a number of other distinguished Members here, and we certainly need them to have time to speak. I have spoken too long.

Mr. Speaker, I simply want to say I thank the gentleman from New York for his special order, and I say God bless you and the other freshmen in the 104th Congress for coming to the rescue of us senior citizens who have been

fighting this fight so long short-handedly.

Mr. FORBES. I thank the gentleman.

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from New York yield, please?

Mr. FORBES. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Idaho.

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, as I sat here and listened to the debate this evening, I found that our good colleagues from the other side of the aisle just simply don't understand some of the basic economic dynamics that have come into play over the last 30 years, and that is the reason that the call and the mounting movement for the support of the Barton amendment is now in place.

I heard the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina say that borrowing is the American way. Everybody borrows. We borrow money to buy a house, we borrow money to buy a car, we borrow here and we borrow there, so why shouldn't the Federal Government borrow?

I just borrowed money to buy a car, and I engaged in a mutual contract where there were mutual benefits of the bargain. I received a car, and I borrowed money while they, the lender, made money from my borrowing, but it was by mutual consent.

What my distinguished colleagues misunderstand about the basic dynamics of borrowing is the fact that this body, through the public trust, has been entrusted with the ability to tax. That is not lending from the American people, that is taking money by government fiat.

Today the American taxpayer has to spend from January 1 to May 20 just to pay his responsibilities to us because of the power that we have. It is not borrowing. That is a complete misunderstanding.

In fact, today our research shows us that the American people really feel that the Federal Government is a bad investment, that we are using their money as if we were administering a bad charity, where we were taking most of the money for administration, and that is quite true. The services that have been referred to in this body just over the last few minutes sound very good, but the fact is that most of the services are rendered when 80 cents out of every dollar is taken for administration. That is not a good bargain, that is not a good contract.

Mr. Speaker, it was Thomas Jefferson who said so well that it's time that we chain the government and free the people, and that is what the Barton amendment will do. Really, a balanced budget amendment has no substance unless the Barton amendment becomes a reality.

Today this Nation is facing a \$4.7 trillion debt, and we talk in round, pear-shaped tones about \$1 trillion here and \$1 trillion there, and \$100 billion here and \$100 billion there, but we must never forget how big \$1 trillion is.

If we started paying \$1 million a day, day one, year one, and paid \$1 million a day from that time until today, we would still have to pay \$1 million a day seven days a week for 700 more years into the future to reach just \$1 trillion. Today we very easily talk about our debt being \$4.7 trillion. That is the legacy that we are leaving to our children and grandchildren.

I would say to the gentleman from New York, and certainly, Mr. Speaker, the only chain that we can put on the government at this point in time is the Barton amendment. I am very proud to support the Barton amendment.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentlewoman, as we sit here in the bastion of Federal spending, Washington, DC, would the gentlewoman care to venture, based on her conversations with the folks back home, about what their feelings are about putting a tax limitation on the balanced budget amendment?

Mrs. CHENOWETH. If the gentleman will continue to yield, I am receiving hundreds of calls from my State of Idaho in support of the Barton amendment. The President of the United States referred last night in his speech to the fact that there was a shout in 1992 that went across the Nation, there was a shout that went across the Nation in 1994, but he said America isn't singing.

But I will say to the gentleman from New York that America will be singing when we pass the Barton amendment, because only with the Barton amendment will we then begin to see the stability in our tax structure and in our government programs that will free small business and large business; will we be able to give individuals and businesses the ability to anticipate what they will be able to do with their future and their capital.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, as I venture around eastern Long Island, where I am from, and talk to small business men and women and average families on my weekend visits home, they tell me increasingly that they do not understand a Washington that feels this compulsion to continue to spend, and does not think about looking in the checkbook to see if there is really any money there.

I think that they would tell us this evening that if the Federal Government started acting like they do and only spent the kind of money that was coming in, as opposed to mortgaging us well into three and four generations out, that they would have more respect for their Federal government and the ways of Washington.

It just causes me to pause here for a moment to wonder why we don't have multitudes rushing to get on board this tax limitation balanced budget amendment and to get it passed as soon as possible. Of course, that is what we are working tonight to encourage.

Mrs. CHENOWETH. If the gentleman will continue to yield, I believe we are seeing this growing dynamic, Mr.

Speaker, outside these halls. The only thing is that is incumbent upon us and our colleagues to have the ears to hear from the American people.

It was not due to so much of an ideologic bent that caused the wave that we saw in the elections in November of last year. I think it focuses to one thing, and that is that a year and a half ago the Congress passed the largest tax increase, an unconstitutional tax increase, in the history of this Nation, and we saw the reaction to that November 8.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. FORBES. I would be honored to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from yielding.

Mr. Speaker, since the 1980's the Democrats in Congress have argued that fiscal discipline, not a constitutional amendment, is needed to balance the budget, but absent a constitutional amendment, Congress has refused to make any progress in balancing the budget. In fact, it has resisted serious efforts to hold the line on reducing spending. Clearly, a constitutional amendment is needed to force Congress to make the tough decisions it has dodged for years. I know that my friends and neighbors in Pennsylvania and in fact all across America feel that same way.

□ 2140

Forty years of deficit spending have got us in that trouble. Like the gentleman from Idaho said, over \$4.7 trillion, and in real dollars that we can relate to, that is \$18,300 for every man, woman and child in America.

You say, "How do we solve this problem?" We solve it by adopting tomorrow, and I hope that everyone will call their Congressman and talk to him about it, or their Congresswoman, and talk about the Barton tax limitation balanced budget amendment. That has teeth, that is the centerpiece of the Contract With America.

It also will have along with it in the next days and weeks ahead, a line-item veto to cut out pork-barrel spending. Unfunded mandates that we have put upon our States and local communities will be eliminated. Welfare reform, we will make sure that we have able-bodied people that do not want to be on welfare back to work. With regulation reform and sunseting Federal agencies, all of those programs together will make sure we have fiscal responsibility here in the United States.

Frankly, those who are here with us tonight on the Republican side of the aisle want to put Congress on a diet and I think that all of the Members of Congress who look at this clearly and carefully, Republicans and Democrats alike, will want to vote for the Barton amendment. It deals with tax limitation as well as balanced budget.

We need to lead by example here in this Congress. States, counties and all

local governments have to live on a budget, a balanced budget. They cannot have deficit financing. Our families cannot have deficit financing. Our businesses cannot have deficit financing. So how can the Federal Government expect others to have their houses in order when we do not have ours? Even the Wall Street Journal has endorsed the Barton tax limitation balanced budget amendment.

This point I think is also important, Congressman FORBES from New York, who has been doing a great job here tonight leading this debate, many organizations have endorsed this proposal: Americans for Tax Reform, United States Chamber of Commerce, Citizens Against Government Waste, National Federation of Independent Business, National Taxpayers Union, Coalition for America, National Association for Manufacturers, Realtors, Homebuilders, and hundreds of other groups.

I am asking my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to do what is best for America, to make sure we get our fiscal house in order, we spend less, we tax less, but we spend on items that the Contract With America talks about, those things that people really need, and eliminate the waste, eliminate the wasteful spending, and let us get America back on track.

I yield back to the gentleman from New York and thank him for taking the leadership role here in this debate tonight.

Mr. FORBES. Would the gentleman yield for some questions here for just a moment, if we could?

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. I just want to make sure we preserve time for my friend the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FORBES. My concern is that of course in November, the American people took dramatic action and they allowed the Republicans to take control of the House of Representatives for the first time in 40 years. I think the effort here obviously was that they wanted things done differently in Washington.

If the gentleman from Pennsylvania would comment on an overriding concern I have that watching this body for so many years that the naysayers, the doomsayers often tend to win the day when something as dramatic as balancing the Federal budget with a tax limitation is brought to the floor.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. I think we have seen a whole new changing of the President last night in his State of the Union address. It is very clear for the doomsayers; they like to say we are going to cut Social Security. Absolutely hogwash. As you well know, Congressman, the fact of the matter is that Social Security is off the table. All of our senior citizens will be protected. And the fact is that people across America in every single district, in every single State are saying we want a balanced budget amendment and we want the Barton one, the one that is going to call for tax limitations.

People do not want to see wasteful spending. When they see their tax bills, they know that is happening in this Congress. I think people are getting the message all across America. I hope those on the other side listened to what the President said last night about reaching out to America. He saw the result from last November's election and he wants a join us in the Contract With America. Let us get this bill to his desk and get it signed.

Mr. FORBES. I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORBES. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. SHADEGG. I thank the gentleman and commend him for his leadership in this fight.

I rise tonight simply to add my voice to those voices that have spoken out.

As I sat back and listened, all too often on this floor we talk in kind of government-speak. We talk about the Barton amendment or the tax limitation amendment. In Arizona when we carried this debate forward, we called it the supermajority amendment. Unfortunately, there are a lot of people back home who perhaps do not understand those terms. But it is really straightforward, and it is important that people understand.

Paul Harvey has said, and I admire him greatly, that self-government without self-discipline does not work. Tomorrow there will be a historic vote on the floor of this House. It is a vote which is focused around that notion. That is, that to preserve self-government, we must institute self-discipline. And what is the form of that self-discipline? It is a change to the United States Constitution. But it is a change that many people in this body I do not believe understand yet and that many people at home may not yet understand.

Oh, they understand that we will vote tomorrow on a balanced budget amendment, and they understand that the Federal Government must balance its budget because they know they have to balance their own budget. And they are very much aware that we are awash in Washington in a sea of red ink that is literally drowning the Nation and threatening our survival.

But this debate tomorrow goes one step beyond that. We cannot simply agree to balance the budget. We must recognize that that alone is not at the root of America's problem. The root of America's problem is that government taxes too much and it spends too much.

I was born in 1949. One year later, the average American family with children paid \$1 out of \$25 in federal taxes. In 1993, just a short year ago, it was \$1 out of every \$4 in taxes.

In 1950, it was \$1 out of \$25. Today it essentially is something in excess of \$1 out of every \$4. We cannot continue on that path.

The tax burden is crushing our families. It is crushing our small businesses. It is crushing our economies.

How many households are required, indeed compelled, to have both spouses work just to have one pay the tax burden for that family? And mind you, and I might remind those on this floor that that \$1 out of \$25 and the \$1 out of \$4 is just Federal taxes. It does not even begin to contemplate the addition of State and local taxes.

What have we gotten for this massive increase in taxes? We have gotten a massive Federal Government which fundamentally fails to do its burden.

Is the crime rate in America lower in 1993 than it was in 1950? Did we buy safer streets with that massive increase in taxes? We did not.

Are welfare recipients in our cities better off? Has the level of poverty in America fallen? It has not. We have failed.

Those who have argued that each problem that comes along simply needs a few more dollars have been proven flat wrong. Government is not the answer. Higher taxes are not the answer.

How then do we stop those taxes? The answer is what Paul Harvey said. It is self-discipline. We need to add to the American Constitution something that is necessary in order to restrict the ability of the people who sit on this floor to continue to tax "you" to pay for what "he" needs, and we need to do that in the form of what has been called in this discussion tonight the Barton amendment, or the supermajority amendment, or the tax limitation amendment.

It is this simple. It says that it has been too easy in America to raise taxes, so we are going to raise the threshold, not from 50 percent, not one-half of the Members of this body plus one, but a slight raise, indeed for me not enough, to a 60 percent requirement to try to institute some discipline.

Those who have gone before me tonight have pointed out that Congress time and again has said that it was going to cut taxes, has said that it was going to cut spending, and it has failed over and over and over again. Without external discipline, it will fail again.

If we enact a balanced budget amendment alone, we may indeed balance our budget, but we will do it at the expense of raising taxes.

The message sent by the people of America on November 8 was clear. It was that we must balance the Federal budget not by tax increases, not by increasing the burden on the backs of the American family who are already over-taxed, but by cutting spending. And the most important step we can take in that direction is to pass a balanced budget amendment with a restriction that says, "You cannot raise taxes again, Federal Government, unless you get 60 percent of the Members of Congress to agree." We need to put that in the Constitution so it is sacrosanct.

Let me briefly conclude by the history in Arizona. Two years ago in Arizona, we fought this battle and we won. We won with citizen support. We took an initiative to the streets. We said to the spenders at the Arizona State capitol, no more.

□ 2150

The Arizona constitution had in it from statehood a balanced budget requirement. But the spenders, those who believe that they can solve every problem facing society just by raising taxes and creating a government program, got carried away and year after year after year, they raised our taxes and increased government spending.

Do you know what they did? They damaged the Arizona economy. It plummeted from one of the best climates in the Nation, with a healthy economy and happy families and a prosperous place to come to an economy where we tax more than the State of Massachusetts and where it was a damaged economy.

So, we said no. We went to the streets with an initiative called "It's Time" initiative, and by a vote of over 70 percent we amended the Arizona constitution to say that there would be no future net increases in Arizona's taxes without a two-thirds majority of the members of the legislature.

We must do that here. We must do it now. I implore those citizens listening tonight to join us in this fight. It is not an initiative, but your voice heard by your Member of Congress tonight or tomorrow that can make the critical difference in this race.

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORBES. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Speaker, I heard a story about a little boy recently who wrote a letter to God, and in that letter he said: "Dear God, please send me \$10." I guess he thought that would be the best way to get the money. And the post office, not knowing where else to send the letter, sent it to the Office of the President. The President thought it was a very cute story, so he decided to send the little boy a dollar.

A couple of weeks later the little boy received the dollar in the mail, and he was very, very disappointed. So he wrote another letter back to God, and this time it said, "Dear God, thank you very much for the money. But as you recall, I asked for \$10. Next time please don't send it by way of Washington. Those folks took \$9 out of the \$10."

I do not think truer words were ever spoken. The fact is, this place taxes too much.

When I was a little boy from a small family of 6 children, my father bringing up his family had to pay roughly about 2 percent of his income to the Federal Government. As Archie Bunker would say, "Those were the days." But now we have taxed our way into oblivion. And what have we got to show for it?

As the previous speaker mentioned, is the crime rate any better, and as a result of the Great Society programs of the 1960's, has our War on Poverty succeeded? With the programs we have instituted here in Washington, DC., have we really made things better or have we made things worse? I would submit we have made things much worse, and that is because of these failed programs. We have taxed and broken the backs of the American people, of the small businesses out there, and it is time to draw some lines in the sand. It is time for us to follow up and to do that thing that Thomas Jefferson regretted not putting in the Constitution, and that is a balanced budget requirement.

We can even go one step better and make it tougher to tax. I cannot fathom how anybody in this body would not want to make it tougher to raise taxes on individuals out there who are struggling to make ends meet. I personally have four children. I consider myself the most average of average people. I came here not a man of wealth, but a man that had to struggle from paycheck to paycheck, and I understand what it is like out there in the real world to try to raise a family. My wife had to work a second job as well just to try to make ends meet, just so that we could pay our debt to Uncle Sam. And frankly, I think my children would be much better off, and so does she, if she would be able to spend a little bit more time at home with them rather than work to pay off Uncle Sam.

If this truly is going to be a family-friendly Congress, and one that cares about people, let us draw that line in the sand. Let us pass the Barton amendment. Let us make it tough to raise taxes.

I live in the same State as Mr. SHADEGG does and served in the State legislature, and let me tell my colleagues, in the 1980's we were fourth in the Nation in per capita tax increases. It seems our answer for solving the problems of Arizona year after year after year was to raise taxes. And finally, when we got some common sense from the people, we, through the initiative process, passed a two-thirds requirement for any tax increase. And you know something, it did not paralyze government. In fact, after 3 consecutive years of decreasing taxes, out of a \$4.5 billion State budget we had a \$800 surplus this year by decreasing taxes.

The same phenomena could happen at the Federal level. But we have to make tough decisions. But the people who elected us, elected me, elected me to come here and fight hard for them, not for government. They elected me to come here to stop spending and fight taxes at the same time, and I intend to do that.

Just finally, I would like to reiterate what my colleague, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. SHADEGG] did. Please, those who are out there, please,

we implore you, call your Congressman or your congresswoman, ask them, no, demand that they support the Barton amendment. It is crucial to each and every one of us.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORBES. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I really want to thank the gentleman tonight for pulling this together. I think there is a lot of confusion as to what is going on.

To follow up on what the gentleman from Arizona said, as I campaigned in Indiana, and I was I think in over 40 different parades in the small towns and cities, nobody came out and said, "Hey, MARK, will you see if you can expand the power of the government in Washington? Will you see if you can figure out how to spend more money ought there? And by the way, can you tax me a little bit more?"

That is not what the American people sent us here to do. They sent us here to reduce the size of government and to reduce the burden and to give them control over their lives.

We are saying that in our unfunded mandates. We are saying it in the line item veto, and we are looking at it here in the balanced budget amendment with tax limitations.

This is for your children's future. I have 3 children. I am concerned not so much about myself. A number of my colleagues here have and I have a little bit of gray hair, some a little less than that, and this is not really just about our future. It is about our kids' future and whether we are mortgaging it, and that is both on the tax side and the spending side.

I believe myself that none of the amendments that are coming up are satisfactory. They are not tough enough. There should be a spending limitation that is written in there to protect the taxpayers and the citizens of America. There should be some sort of a penalty if you do not reach a balanced budget.

I am concerned that some of these spending cuts can be illusory, that we will wind up with a deficit. There is no penalty for having that deficit, and it could accumulate.

This does not start until the year 2002. That is putting a lot of faith that we can stand here and get it to that point. So I have a number of concerns with that.

Yet, tomorrow and in the next few days the key thing is not whether we are going to pass a balanced budget amendment, because there is a majority in this body to pass a balanced budget amendment. This is a tax debate, and it is not even all taxes. We are down to income taxes and we are reduced to saying can we not at least have some protection, not a two-thirds protection. You know, if we polled Indiana, they would want 100 percent protection.

At one point I answered a question to one of the newspapers in Indiana. They said, "Would you support a tax increase?" I said, "If we were in war, and if the only way to pay for it was through a tax increase, I might consider a tax increase," because people want the spending reduced. They do not want their taxes raised. And we are down to one little clause, a 60 percent supermajority on the taxes, and we cannot get, it seems, to this point enough to get over the top. We need the people of America to call in, to let their Members know that we need their help, we need their vote or we may get an amendment that will merely lead to illusory budget cuts and certain taxes.

We have been down this road before. It was miserable. We need to stop it. People have lost faith in us, and we need to give them a down payment on faith by passing the Barton amendment.

Mr. FORBES. I thank the gentleman. Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORBES. I yield to my distinguished colleague from South Carolina.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, do my colleagues not feel like we are at a telethon tonight and we are not asking you to give anything, we are trying to give you money?

Let us really explain what we are talking about here in real terms. Does the gentleman agree with this statement, that if every Republican voted for the Barton amendment we could not get there by ourselves? Does the gentleman agree with that statement?

Mr. FORBES. I do.

Mr. GRAHAM. Will the gentleman yield further for another question?

Mr. FORBES. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. GRAHAM. Does the gentleman believe that there are 60 Members in the Democratic Party, which in many ways has a great tradition in this country, who believe that the time has come to limit government, to turn over fiscal responsibility back to the States, and that there are 60 Members in that great party that will step up and help us fill the mandate of November 8? Does the gentleman believe there are 65 Members over there that could do that?

□ 2200

I think with the encouragement of the American people that there are certainly 60 of our distinguished colleagues on the Democrat side that would come join us.

Mr. GRAHAM. If the gentleman would yield further, would you agree that it is probably the best thing that could happen for the future of this country, not just in the 104th Congress, but for the 21st century, for two parties with different opinions coming together under one roof, based on the principle that if we continue to spend this way we will bankrupt the American character, and this would really be a way to fulfill what President Clinton said in his State of the Union that we can work together to make this

country better? And we have a historic opportunity and all we need is 60 Democrats who will help us fulfill our mandate. Do you agree with that statement?

Mr. FORBES. I agree with the gentleman on that statement. I think we have proof in 1990 and 1993 where there was a rush to raise taxes that the American people want this body unified, the House of Representatives to act responsibly, and embrace tax limitation, a balanced budget amendment.

Mr. GRAHAM. Thank you.

Mr. FORBES. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. WELLER. Well, I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. FORBES], my good friend from Long Island. I want to commend you for your leadership in organizing tonight's discussion of the tax-limitation, balanced budget amendment.

I just came from my office, and I have been receiving phone calls tonight from taxpayers in my congressional district which, of course, is the south suburbs of Chicago, rural areas, industrial communities, probably the most diverse district in the State of Illinois, and I have received a good number of phone calls.

I am glad I answered the phone. Because they were calling in support of the tax-limitation, balanced budget amendment and from those calls, and every one of them were from middle-class average working men and women. They are concerned about the massive deficit and its impact on the future and their children's future, and they point out, or I had three of them point out, they are aware that the average cost today for every man, woman, and child in the 11th Congressional District in Illinois, as throughout this country, is \$18,000 for every man, woman, and child. The average taxpayer is aware of these things.

Congress for far too long has thought that the average taxpayer just did not know. Well, the taxpayers are better informed today.

You know, in the past Congress has said, "Trust us, we will balance the budget. We have got the discipline. We will do it." Well, they have never kept their promise, and they have failed.

One call tonight from a working man from the city of Joliet, an industrial community of about 100,000 in the heart of my congressional district, was frustrated. He is a man who drives a long distance to work, works in industry, and he was frustrated by last year's tax hike which, of course, the administration and the liberal majority in the previous Congress proposed as their solution and imposed it upon the people and the taxpayers in my district as well as yours, and they were aware that that tax increase last year cost the taxpayers in my district \$410 million, \$60 million in higher gasoline taxes which drives up costs for average working middle-class families, just to go to work or go to the store, and \$90



million in higher taxes on Social Security benefits for the senior citizens in my district alone.

Well, that family, as well as others, they have seen their taxes go up, and they have not seen any results in reduction of the deficit or long-term discipline over controlling Congress' historic ability to overspend. They want to be able to afford to go to work and take care of their families' needs, and they want to be able to live comfortably in retirement. They want Congress, they told me tonight, to have Congress to have the discipline and the confidence to cut spending and to oppose higher taxes and, at the same time, protect Social Security.

Today with the passage of the Flanagan resolution, this Congress is on record saying that Social Security is off the table.

#### THE BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GEKAS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTON] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. WELLER. Well, you know, thank you. I would like very much to thank the gentleman from Texas for your hard-fought long effort historically to bring this initiative to the floor of the House for debate, and you have worked long and hard to bring a tax-limitation balanced budget amendment, and I just want you to know the phone calls that I have been receiving in my office here in Washington tonight from the taxpayers in my district, they are calling. I had six calls tonight.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I, too, have received a number of telephone calls, and I had a constituent call my office in Texas today and said, "We want Congressman BARTON to vote for that Barton three-fifths tax-limitation amendment." And my receptionist said, "Well, he is the named sponsor." He said, "Well, you just tell him if he does not vote for it, he is not going to get my vote next year." She said, "Well, I think you can expect the Congressman to vote for his own amendment."

But there may be some people in this Chamber that want to make a phone call to their Congressman and do not know the phone number. The number, if anybody in the Chamber would like to make such a phone call tomorrow, is area code 202, 224-3121, and then just ask for their Congressman, Congressman BARTON, Congressman FORBES, Congressman WELLER, you know, whoever your Congressman happens to be, and you will be put through, and since the vote is going to be at about 11, 11:30, Eastern time tomorrow, those phone calls should come in earlier. If Congressman FORBES wanted to call his own office, he would need to do that before 11:30 tomorrow morning.

I yield back to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. WELLER. You are absolutely right. You know, there is nothing I value more than hearing from the folks that I have the privilege of representing, and when I know that I get 10 phone calls from the taxpayers in my district, I recognize that they probably represent a total of 100 voters who agree with them and just did not take the time to make the telephone call. So those telephone calls, I know, are extremely important and, you know, one of the questions that a caller told me tonight is that they say, you know, the Republicans are in the majority now. It is going to be an easy sell. You are going to be able to pass that, are you not? I said, "Well, you realize it takes a supermajority to pass a constitutional amendment like this." We need a bipartisan vote. We need, if every Republican votes for this, we need over 60 Democrats to support us, and I said, "You know, if you have friends that know Democratic Members of Congress that they should call them and support the balanced budget amendment."

It is so very important that they make calls, and I certainly made that point, and again, I want to thank my colleague for his leadership on this issue. It is so important that we give Congress the discipline, the backbone to balance the budget and to resist the temptation to go back to the old ways which is always to raise taxes.

I served in the legislature for the last 6 years in Illinois. We were fortunate to have a balanced budget provision in the State constitution. That was effective in giving those of us who wanted to balance the books the backbone, the discipline, to get the job done before we went home.

However, my State is one of those that unfortunately does not have what we call the tax accountability amendment, and we are still trying to do that in Illinois, which would require a three-fifths vote. We know if you require a three-fifths vote to pass a tax increase, those who would like to push a tax increase know it is going to be much more difficult, and the obvious solution is to cut spending.

Congress needs that discipline. I am proud to cosponsor the Barton amendment, the tax-limitation balanced budget amendment, in the Contract with America, and I certainly am proud to join with you tonight and participate in tonight's discussion on this important initiative which frankly is a historic change on how Washington works.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from New York if he sought time.

Mr. FORBES. I thank the gentleman. I would say that it is startling to me to listen to this experiment that they had in Arizona, if you will, the notion that they went forward and did the responsible thing, but they did not hold the taxes, and the people of Arizona

unfortunately were the recipients of some bad policy that hurt them over the years, and my concern here is that our Federal taxpayers, our folks back home, understand the urgency of getting to the phones and making sure that Members of Congress understand that they want Congress, while they want them to balance the budget, they do not want them to take the easy way out and increase spending and that they want a balanced budget amendment that does put a lid on the ability to raise taxes.

I know the people on Long Island, we have amongst the highest taxes in the Nation. We have the highest property taxes and sales taxes and Federal taxes to boot, and it is tough on the people of Long Island and our economy is still very shaky there, and people are struggling to hold onto their jobs, and many people do not have jobs. They are looking for them.

The difficulty is to think that you have a Federal Government that just does not quite get it and continues to grow at alarming rates, and the need, I think, across America is understood, the need for a balanced budget amendment, and most particularly the need again, and I cannot stress it enough, the need to make sure that it is a balanced budget that does put a lid on this Congress' ability to just wantonly raise taxes.

□ 2210

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I thank the gentleman from New York and I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SOUDER. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. Speaker, I have a question. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FORBES] and myself have served as staffers in the other body and have some healthy skepticism. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTON] as a Member maybe could enlighten us a bit. Under the balanced budget amendment, and part of the reason I am sure the gentleman has his tax limitation supermajority in it, is it not possible to have a category that would say with waste and fraud as a deficit reduction?

Mr. BARTON of Texas. In my town meetings, and I am sure as the gentleman begins to do his town meetings, his constituents are going to come and demand that he cut out that waste, fraud, and abuse and cut out pork-barrel spending. The gentleman would say that he will do it and he is going to be a bulldog to do it. The problem is there is no line in the Federal Government's budget that says waste, fraud, and abuse. When you get to a specific program and you say, "Mr. Director, can you tell me where the waste, fraud, and abuse is, in your particular program?" And the director is going to say, "Congressman, there is no waste, fraud, and abuse in my program."

Now, I was a White House Fellow at the Department of Energy in 1981, part of 1982, and was a staff liaison to the Grace Commission that President